

All who knew David remember his Savannah smile and his proud expressions whenever he talked about Savannah's accomplishments. David's countless friends and family members consider him one of the most generous people they knew.

He was on the boards of the Chat-ham-Savannah Authority for the Homeless and the Coastal Center for Development Services, was a founding member of the St. David's Society of Savannah, and served two terms as a Republican County Commissioner.

I am thankful for the immense impact he had on the Savannah community, and I know his legacy will remain.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

□ 0915

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 473, I call up the bill (H.R. 256) to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 256.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256. Let me start off by thanking my very good friend and part-

ner, BARBARA LEE, the author of this bill. I am proud to stand with her in her unyielding quest to repeal the 2002 AUMF, and I congratulate her early on for working so hard for over 20 years to get this done.

Nineteen years ago, as a junior Member of Congress, I faced one of the most consequential decisions of my career as an elected official with the United States Congress. The drumbeats of war were reverberating throughout Capitol Hill as the Bush administration prepared to invade Iraq. After carefully considering all the evidence before us, including unanswered questions about post-Saddam Iraq, I cast my vote against authorizing military force against the Hussein regime.

But our vote this morning to repeal the 2002 AUMF is not about relitigating our past. Rather, repealing this outdated authorization is about planning strategically for our future. It is about Congress reclaiming its constitutional obligation to weigh in on matters of war and peace.

On substance, the case for repealing the 2002 AUMF is unassailable. The 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any ongoing military operations in Iraq. The United States is not relying on the 2002 AUMF as the sole authority for any military operations. It has been used as an additional legal justification for strikes by Presidents from both parties but not as the sole authority for any strikes over the last decade. The Biden administration, in an unprecedented move, has announced support for the legislation we are moving today.

Repeal is crucial because the executive branch has a history of stretching the 2002 AUMF's legal authority. It has already been used as justification for military actions against entities that had nothing to do with Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist dictatorship, simply because such entities were operating in Iraq.

Given all of the countries active near Iraq today, including Turkey and Russia, the 2002 AUMF is vulnerable to being abused.

I have heard from my friend, the ranking member, Mr. McCAUL, as well as other Members opposed to this legislation who expressed two concerns: one on the process, about the need for further briefings and conversations, and another on substance, about Iran-backed groups in Iraq.

On procedure, we should dispel ourselves of the fiction that this is a new issue. Congress has been debating what to do in a post-Saddam Iraq for 18 years, and our status of forces agreement expired in 2011. This has been a frontline issue for nearly two decades, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee moved this bill through regular order.

Regarding the concern about Iran-backed groups, let me once again reiterate that the 2002 AUMF was about removing the Hussein regime in Iraq. It had absolutely nothing to do with Iran. A decade and a half before the 2002

AUMF was passed, Iran and Iraq were fighting each other in a vicious war that lasted almost a decade.

If the President needs to strike these groups to defend our Nation, our diplomatic personnel, or our Armed Forces, he can do so under Article II of the Constitution. If any Armed Forces personnel on the ground need to defend themselves, they have the inherent right under unit self-defense principles.

Today, Congress has a historic opportunity to repeal this outdated authorization and reassert its proper authority over the solemn matters of war and peace.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Chairman MEEKS. We work well together. When we disagree, we do it civilly, and I think that is the way this body should operate. But I do disagree on this one.

I have said many times before that war should not be on autopilot. I do think this is an outdated AUMF, and I do believe that Congress needs to reclaim its war powers under Article I of the Constitution.

I also share the desire to repeal the 2002 AUMF, as well as the 2001 AUMF, but that must be part of a serious process to provide clear, updated authorities against the terrorists who still plot to kill Americans at home and abroad. I still hope to work toward that end with my respected friend, Chairman MEEKS, but a repeal and replacement should be simultaneous.

It is confusing to me that we are jamming through a standalone repeal without basic due diligence; without consulting the State Department, the Defense Department, or the intelligence community; without consulting the Government of Iraq and our coalition partners and allies.

In the 3 months since I made that complaint at our markup, the majority still has not scheduled a single briefing. This, in my judgment, is not a serious legislative process for the most serious issues that we face, and that is war and peace.

This feels like yet another political effort to undo one of President Trump's boldest counterterrorism successes: using the 2002 AUMF to remove Qasem Soleimani from the battlefield.

Soleimani was Iran's mastermind of terror for decades. He was responsible for the death of more than 600 Americans and wounded thousands more. He orchestrated the attack on our Baghdad Embassy. He plotted to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador on American soil here in D.C. He oversaw Iran's support for Assad, who killed hundreds of thousands in Syria. In short, America and the world are much safer with Qasem Soleimani gone.

While the 2002 AUMF was largely about Saddam Hussein, it also clearly

addressed the terrorist threats in and emanating from Iraq. All prior administrations, Republican and Democrat, have used it for that purpose.

Today, the biggest threat in Iraq is not Saddam Hussein. We can all recognize that. But it is the Iran-sponsored terrorist groups attacking our diplomats, our soldiers, our embassy, and our citizens. They cannot be targeted using the 2001 AUMF because they are not associated with the forces of al-Qaida, the Taliban, or ISIS, but they can be targeted using the 2002 AUMF, as the prior administration did to take out Soleimani, consistent with longstanding practice.

Last year, the Trump administration “strongly opposed” repeal, saying it would “terminate a critical legal authority” and undermine our defense “against ongoing threats from Iran and Iranian-sponsored proxies.”

The Biden administration now claims that it does not need the 2002 AUMF for current operations because it has Article II authority to use force without congressional authorization.

Is that what we are going to do now, is yield to the President's Article II authority without any congressional authorization?

Madam Speaker, that is precisely what this repeal does. It takes our authority, our Article I authorities, away. We are repealing our Article I authority and yielding it to the President of the United States.

Telling the President to rely solely on Article II, in my judgment, is a big step backward from the war powers reform and reasserting Congress' Article I powers.

It is also inconsistent with the War Powers Resolution. That law says that the President's Article II powers are limited to responding to an attack on the territory or Armed Forces of the United States. It does not cover American civilians in a foreign country, such as our contractors, our diplomats, and our embassy, who are under attack, as I speak, in Iraq.

We should not encourage any President to go it alone without Article I congressional authorization.

Finally, today's vote is not happening in a vacuum. This rushed, standalone repeal, without any consultation with the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the intelligence community, as Mr. MAST has consistently talked about, sends a dangerous message of disengagement that could destabilize Iraq, embolden Iran, which it will, and strengthen al-Qaida and ISIS in the region.

We would avoid such dangers by taking up a repeal and a replacement simultaneously. I think both sides of the aisle agree, we need to update this AUMF, and we need to reform it to the modern-day threats in the region. Saddam Hussein is no longer the threat.

Real AUMF reform requires Congress and the administration to work together. The chairman has committed to doing this, and I appreciate and

trust him. We work well together, but we have to do this, to work together with the administration to replace this aging AUMF with updated authorities needed to keep Americans safe from today's terrorist threats, an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats in the region.

Again, I look forward to working together with Chairman MEEKS and our colleagues on this if we are going to be serious about war powers reform. But this bill is not it. This bill is not responsible. We are not doing this the right way. If we are going to repeal it, let's update the AUMF to modern-day needs and reform it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me first thank our chairman, Mr. MEEKS, for moving this bill through committee. It wasn't an easy lift, and his leadership was extremely important in getting us to where we are today.

I also thank Leader HOYER, Speaker PELOSI, and let me take a minute to thank our staff: My chief of staff, Julie Nickson, who is here with us today; my legislative director, Gregory Adams; Congressman MEEKS' staff; and all of the staff members who have worked for 20 years to get us to this point.

I also want to thank our Democratic and Republican cosponsors and our outside broad spectrum of groups, like the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Win Without War, the American Legion, and Americans for Prosperity that have fought alongside us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy and letters of support from many of these groups.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 256—REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—REP. LEE, D-CA WITH 134 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (“2002 AUMF”). This bipartisan legislation would terminate the October 16, 2002, statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iraq.

The Administration supports the repeal of the 2002 AUMF, as the United States has no ongoing military activities that rely solely on the 2002 AUMF as a domestic legal basis, and repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations. Furthermore, the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

In working with the Congress on repealing and replacing other existing authorizations of military force, the Administration seeks to ensure that the Congress has a clear and

thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world. As the Administration works with the Congress to reform AUMFs, it will be critical to maintain the clear authority to address threats to the United States' national interests with appropriately decisive and effective military action.

[Press Release—June 14, 2021]

CVA URGES PASSAGE OF 2002 AUMF REPEAL
GRASSROOTS VETERANS GROUP APPLAUDS REP. LEE, BIPARTISAN LEADERSHIP ON CRITICAL MEASURE TO RESTORE BALANCE OF POWER

ARLINGTON, VA.—Concerned Veterans for America (CVA) Executive Director Nate Anderson released the following statement urging the U.S. House to pass H.R. 256, Rep. Barbara Lee's bill to repeal the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF):

“Debating, authorizing, and exercising oversight of American military action is one of Congress's most solemn duties. Unfortunately, Congress has largely deferred to the executive branch and neglected its role in matters of war and peace over the last twenty years. Repealing the 2002 AUMF would be an important step toward Congress reasserting its constitutional role in shaping foreign policy and giving the American people a voice. We applaud Rep. Lee for her continued leadership on this issue along with the broad coalition of bipartisan representatives and organizations who have found common ground in this endeavor.”

BACKGROUND

Americans for Prosperity, a partner of CVA, issued a Key Vote Alert for this measure, signaling it will take into account lawmakers' votes in its annual legislative scorecard.

CVA recently led a coalition in sending a letter to members of Congress urging support of a bipartisan resolution introduced by Sens. Kaine and Young to repeal a pair of obsolete AUMFs. The group was joined on the letter by Defense Priorities Initiative, Freedom Works, and the R Street Institute.

CVA has been working to repeal the outdated 2001 and 2002 AUMFs for years, making it a priority for its grassroots and advocacy efforts in its annual policy agendas (2019, 2020, 2021). Notably, though less than a fifth of current members of Congress voted on the 2001 AUMF, it has been invoked to justify 41 operations in 19 countries since passage.

In 2019, the group partnered with VoteVets, a traditional rival, to urge lawmakers to reclaim their constitutional war powers duties. The New York Times wrote about the unlikely partnership. Setting the example for lawmakers and the administration, the groups found common ground on this issue and flew activists and volunteers in to DC to meet with their members of Congress to bring lasting policy change in Washington.

CVA has been staunch in its support of lawmakers who have taken a principled stand and worked to repeal these measures in the past. In 2019, CVA welcomed the addition of the bipartisan War Powers Caucus to Congress, applauding lawmakers for prioritizing the issue. CVA also launched a digital ad campaign thanking lawmakers for standing against endless war, praising lawmakers for voting to ensure proper Congressional input before any offensive military force against Iran.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, As organizations from across the ideological spectrum, we are committed to addressing one of our country's most critical national security needs: ending our forever wars. We don't always agree on the reasons to do so, but we do

agree that nearly two decades of endless war has failed to make us safer and a new approach is necessary. To achieve this goal and reorient U.S. foreign policy away from the unaccountable, interventionist approach we've seen for nearly two decades, Congress must sunset the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Since its enactment on September 14, 2001, the 2001 AUMF has served as a blank check for endless, global war under multiple presidents. Despite congressional intent to only give then-President George W. Bush the authority to use military force against those responsible for the 9/11 attacks and those who harbored them, the law failed to include any time limits, geographic constraints, specific objectives or an exit strategy. As a result, three successive presidents have used the law to unilaterally expand the nation's use of military force against individuals, groups, and even nation states never intended by Congress. Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump have used the 2001 AUMF to justify U.S. military action in 19 countries at least 41 times. The expansive U.S. militarized counterterrorism footprint now extends to at least 80 countries, costing an estimated \$6.4 trillion, as well as the lives of thousands of American soldiers, and hundreds of thousands of civilians abroad.

Congress passed the 2002 Iraq AUMF to authorize force against the Saddam Hussein regime. It is not required for any ongoing military activities, as the executive branch relies on an overly broad interpretation of the 2001 AUMF for operations against ISIS, al Qaeda, and other groups. However, both the Obama and Trump administrations expanded their interpretation of the scope of the 2002 Iraq AUMF beyond congressional intent. Most recently, the Trump administration cited it as a legal basis for the targeted killing of Iranian general Qassem Soleimani, an action clearly unrelated to the original scope of the authorization. Retaining this law renders it susceptible to further abuse.

President Biden has stated a desire to end the forever wars. With this in mind, Congress should sunset the 2001 AUMF eight months after a law is enacted and immediately repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Rather than expediting a new AUMF, Congress must first publicly debate whether military force is both necessary and appropriate for addressing current security challenges and what, if any, new legal authority may be necessary. In the interim, Article II of the Constitution provides the president with the legal authority needed to defend our country against an actual or truly imminent armed attack.

With a new president who has signalled support for our government's institutional checks and balances and a U.S. public that supports an end to endless war, it is time for Congress seize the opportunity to reassert its constitutional authority over war powers. In fact, the U.S. Constitution places the power to declare war squarely in the hands of Congress for good reason. Our democracy relies on the foundational belief that it is the people to whom the U.S. government remains accountable, not the president. By assigning Congress the sole authority to declare war, our nation's founders sought to ensure that a decision as momentous as the one to wage war was properly debated, scrutinized, and justified. Failing to sunset the 2001 AUMF and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF now will continue to effectively cede Congress' power over war and peace to the executive branch.

In the past five years, the House of Representatives or its committees have voted to repeal both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF, drawing both Democratic and Republican support. With a new administration

who agrees that these authorizations are outdated, now is the time to finish the work Congress started. We urge you to join Rep. Barbara Lee's effort in turning the page on this unsuccessful chapter of U.S. foreign policy by sunseting the 2001 AUMF and repealing the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union, Brennan Center for Justice, Bridges Faith Initiative, BringOurTroopsHome.US, Center for International Policy, Concerned Veterans for America, Council for a Livable World, Demand Progress, Defense Priorities Initiative, FreedomWorks, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Human Rights First, National Religious Campaign Against Torture, Pax Christi USA, Peace Action, Project On Government Oversight, Protect Democracy, Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, R Street Institute, Secure Families Initiative, September 11th Families for Peaceful Tomorrows, The Center for Victims of Torture, VoteVets, Win Without War, Women's Action for New Directions.

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY,

June 15, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES, On behalf of Americans for Prosperity's activists in all 50 states, I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187, the so-called "Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act."

Businesses can be a force for good when they serve customers, drive life-improving innovations, and enable employees to find fulfillment in their work. But the best way to do that is through bottom-up approaches, not top-down regulation. Mobilizing the Securities and Exchange Commission to force industry from all corners of the economy to adhere to dubious, ambiguous, and one-size-fits all requirements—as this bill does—will only harm our ability to improve society and undermine America's capacity to lead in the global economy.

H.R. 1187 represents a sweeping expansion of government overreach and dramatic mission creep for the SEC, which has neither the authority, expertise, nor accountability to evaluate the materiality of these disclosures to shareholders and potential shareholders. Further, the standards these regulations set, and the effectiveness of the methods to which those standards would be met, are unclear. As an example, recent evidence has shown there is virtually no relationship between trends in energy-related carbon emissions and top-down climate policies such as the implementation of international agreements, carbon pricing, cap-and-trade, or command and control sectoral regulation. In fact, since the 2007 Massachusetts v. EPA decision, countries as well as states that have not endorsed these policies have generally reduced per capita energy-related carbon dioxide emissions at a far greater pace than those that have.

Beyond this, the very act of forcing companies to meet preset, one-size-fits-all requirements ultimately undermines the leaps in innovation we need to actually achieve our shared goals for the environment and society as a whole. Business leaders and consumers—not politicians and appointed Washington officials—are the driving force to innovate and deliver superior products and services that solve for the needs of today while also pushing our country toward a better future that benefits all.

This bill would also impose new costly burdens on companies, open the floodgates to cronyism, undermine businesses' ability to create new value, and ultimately put a drag on our recovering economy.

We look forward to working together to improve the environment and address other great challenges facing our country. The best way to do that is through bottom-up innovation, not top-down regulation such as those mandated by this bill.

I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187. This vote will be recorded in our legislative scorecard for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

BRENT GARDNER,
Chief Government Affairs Officer,
Americans for Prosperity.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2021.

Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: On behalf of the nearly two million members of The American Legion, I am pleased to express support for H.R. 256, which would repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to authorize force against Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime in order to defend the United States against the threat posed by the regime's alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction. This threat proved unfounded and the mission undertaken pursuant to the 2002 Iraq AUMF—designated "Operation Iraqi Freedom"—officially ended on December 11, 2011.

Our servicemembers have accomplished their original objectives in Iraq, a dangerous regime was removed, and the authorization for the war should end. With the understanding that complex global threats cannot be solved by military power alone, we value the importance of sustaining a civilian-led approach of elevating diplomacy and development alongside a strong defense. The American Legion stands ready to assist members of Congress with strengthening our nation's interests and ensuring that diplomacy is the first instrument of national power considered at the highest level.

In accordance with American Legion Resolution No. 22: Addressing the 'Forever War', passed unanimously by our National Executive Committee in meetings held October 14–15, 2020, which urges a renewal of a proper constitutional balance to American foreign policy decision-making by encouraging Congress to repeal and replace outdated Authorizations for Use of Military Force, we strongly support this bill.

We applaud your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

For God & Country,

JAMES W. "BILL" OXFORD,
National Commander.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just take a minute to honor my dear friend, the late Congressman Walter Jones, a Republican from North Carolina who was my partner for many years to build bipartisan support to bring our troops home.

I am proud to stand with everyone as we exercise our most important duty assigned by the Constitution to decide when and how America goes to war.

We cannot revise history as it relates to why this authorization was put into place.

Eighteen years ago, in front of the infamous "Mission Accomplished" banner backdrop, former President Bush told the Nation that the major combat operations in Iraq have ended.

In 2011, President Obama brought our combat troops home, and yet this authority remains on the books, vulnerable to misuse because Congress has not acted to remove it.

The Bush administration, yes, misled the American people by saying there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, that Iraq posed an imminent threat by drawing a false connection between the tragic events of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. Those lies and misinformation had deadly consequences. The mistakes continue to haunt us today.

Once the war started, the Out of Iraq Caucus was founded by Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, me, and led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. Over 80 Members joined. Many of us took our protests to the streets, joining hundreds of thousands protesting the unnecessary, immoral war of choice. Year after year, we worked for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops.

I share all this history, not because of nostalgia, but we have to remember why this authorization was passed, because 87 percent of current Members of the House were not here to vote on this AUMF in 2002. The Constitution requires that we cannot appropriate funds for armies for more than 2 years, and yet for almost two decades we have failed to revisit these AUMFs.

To this day, our endless wars continue, costing trillions of dollars and thousands of lives in a war that goes way beyond any scope that Congress conceived or intended.

I want to salute our veterans, our young men and women in uniform. They did everything we have asked them to do. Many veterans support this repeal.

The outdated 2002 AUMF bears no correlation to the threats we face today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the President earlier stated his support for the bill, saying that the 2002 AUMF will not impact current military operations, but repeal can prevent our country from entering another protracted engagement under this outdated authority.

We can't afford to leave this in place indefinitely. For two decades it has been in place. This is our opportunity to restore our constitutional role.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to comment that to me it is very interesting, the timing of the gentlewoman from California's repeal. It happened after President Trump had an air strike to take out Soleimani in Iraq, at exactly the same time. He had authority to do so under the 2002 AUMF and Article II under the Constitution.

What is interesting about now, the other side of the aisle was upset when

President Biden struck the Shia proxies in Syria, and that is when we saw this bill resurrect itself again in this Congress. Very interesting timing.

What I object to is that now we are abdicating our responsibility by giving the President Article II authorities alone without any authorization of use of military force from the Congress. They talk a lot about Article I on the other side, but aren't we abdicating our Article I responsibility?

I am all for updating this thing, but to completely do away with it and just give this President Article II authorities to do whatever he wants without any congressional review, in my judgment, is a wrong step forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I will just say really quickly: Before Soleimani, we had passed a bill on the AUMF in 2019, so it wasn't in response to President Trump. So this was attempted even before that.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), head of the United States delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. Members of the Bush administration seized on our fear at that time to persuade Americans that Saddam Hussein posed a grave threat to the United States, and Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force without any limitation on how long it could be in effect.

Nineteen years later, and ten years after we formally ended ground operations, it is still law. This is an abrogation of Article I responsibilities and duties of the Congress of the United States.

There is no more profound power vested in us in the Constitution than to send our young men and women into combat. It is long past time that we dealt with this AUMF and righted the imbalance between the powers of Article I, which are exclusively those of Congress, and the powers of Article II for a Commander in Chief only after Congress has acted.

I am proud to support this measure today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a member of our HFAC committee with strong foreign affairs credentials.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, on October 16, 2002, the United States Congress voted to authorize military action against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The text of the authorization was clear. That was its purpose. Years later, Saddam Hussein is long dead, and our military action has ended.

The 2002 AUMF is separate and distinct from the 2001 AUMF, which au-

thorized our counterterrorism efforts after 9/11 and which remains in use today.

The 2002 AUMF is not in use. It is long overdue for repeal, which is why we have voted multiple times to repeal the 2002 AUMF with bipartisan support.

Since coming to Congress, I have been very clear, Congress must reassert congressional authority in decisions of war and peace. The authority is required by our Constitution, and it is fundamental to our representation of our constituents, especially our servicemembers.

Our men and women in uniform deserve to see a new era of congressional accountability, one where Members of Congress do not shirk their accountability when it comes to issues of war and peace.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), the vice chair of the subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this critical legislation to repeal the 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force.

I want to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and the chair of this committee for their enduring leadership on this issue.

I was in middle school when Congress passed this authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. Today, as a Member of this body, I am voting to repeal it.

I make this point to remind my colleagues that the decisions around war and peace are some of the most consequential ones we make here. My generation has spent our entire adult lives in the shadow of two long and protracted wars.

I am proud to represent San Diego, a military community that has made incredible sacrifices because of that vote in 2002. Now it is time to take it off the books.

Repealing this authorization would not impact any of our current military operations, but repealing it will prevent a future President from abusing it and reclaim Congress' rightful role in authorizing war, ensuring our servicemembers know that they are not being sent to harm's way without a full debate of this representative body. There is nothing rushed about something that has taken 20 years.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this repeal.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just clarify again. This bill was filed last Congress after President Trump took out the mastermind of terror for two decades in the Middle East, Qasem Soleimani, to challenge his authority to take out one of the biggest

threats to the region and to our American soldiers, 600 of whom were killed and thousands wounded.

That is the genesis for this legislation, and I think that is important to note. If we do away with this without replacing it, we abdicate our Article I authorities in an absolute manner to the executive branch under Article II.

I think that it is important for anyone watching this debate to understand what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I remember over the period of the last Presidency joining my colleagues on both sides of the aisle at various times when statements were made that we are just going to leave Iraq or we are going to leave the Kurds in Syria, and I think that was shortsighted, those statements, so I joined my colleagues on both sides.

But, yet, today, we are debating the repeal of the 2002 AUMF as if we all somehow believe that we are going to magically repeal this and then come up with some narrow replacement that is going to authorize, when we can't really agree that the sky is blue in this group.

But I want to, for a second, look back and say what would have happened when this was introduced originally. So in January of 2014 this repeal was introduced. Let's say we passed it.

What happened since January of 2014? Well, I will tell you. In June of 2014 we began airstrikes against ISIS. Because of the 2002 AUMF, we were able to assist our allies to defeat ISIS in their capital of Raqqa, their stronghold in Mosul, and we even destroyed their caliphate throughout the region.

I know my colleagues who support this legislation have the right intentions in mind, but even President Biden's own Statement of Administration Policy admits that this repeal would have an impact on our military operations. That is why we don't call for a blanket repeal, but a narrowly crafted replacement. Let's do that first.

The bleak reality is that without an authorization to fight terror, more innocent human beings will suffer. Let us not forget the horrors that ISIS perpetrated on innocent men, women, and children. Men were beheaded for practicing their faith, women were stoned to death for trying to flee abusive relationships. Children were made foot soldiers and suicide bombers. Without this AUMF, this would still be happening.

Today, we have militia groups attacking the American Embassy in Baghdad. We have malign forces trying to destabilize the democratically elected Iraqi Government. We have dozens of terror organizations, including ISIS, that want to revive the caliphate which brought so much pain and suffering to so many in the region.

Before we hastily pass this ill-thought-out and ill-timed political leg-

islation, I urge every Member to meet with Intel, to meet with the Department of Defense to hear about the realities of the threats we face in this world, and maybe once that happens and we put aside these partisan stripes for a moment, we can have an honest debate about what a replacement would look like. Short-term political gain has no impact on what foreign actors make in terms of their policy decisions. ISIS and terrorists don't change based on what we debate here, and they certainly didn't give up yet.

We made a decision; the President made a decision to leave Afghanistan. While I disagree with that, I certainly hope he is successful and that my predictions are wrong, but I do know that that sent a message. It sent a message that America is disengaging in the war on terror. What would this send as well, right on the heels of this?

What message would this send to the terrorists who are on the ropes, who haven't attacked in the United States, not because they don't want to, but because we haven't let them because we have fought them on their territory, before they have the ability to organize and attack us here?

What does that message send? Because to a terrorist, all they need is the ability to go out and say, "We are winning," to recruit somebody, to give their life for that terrorist cause.

Madam Speaker, I understand where this is coming from. I deeply would love an AUMF that replaces this the right way, but this is the wrong process and the wrong order to do that. So I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this.

□ 0945

Mr. MEEKS. I want to remind the gentleman that the 2014 strike against ISIS, the primary AUMF, where it was utilized in the 2001 AUMF, continues and still is in existence. Also, when you talk about Soleimani, the primary utilization, still-President Trump talked about Article II. So those still are in existence to protect the American people and at the President's options.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the assistant Speaker.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 19 years ago, this body passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force based on lies and misinformation about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

This authorization has entangled us in a decades-long war, costing billions of dollars and tens of thousands of lives.

Millions of young people in this country, including my three children, have never known an America that wasn't at war.

This repeal is long overdue and absolutely vital to protecting the integrity of our system of checks and balances and the security of our Nation and servicemembers.

Today we stand up for Congress' constitutional war powers and the right to

say "no" to conflicts abroad and "yes" to peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a combat veteran, a distinguished servicemember, and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, war powers and AUMF, it is a distant impersonal term to talk about the work of the warfighter. And I think for people on both sides of the aisle, it is anything but impersonal.

Probably all of us in here know people who have passed in our wars, roads named after them, schools named after them, VFWs, and other buildings named after them. It is not impersonal to those of us in here and to those who have been targeted by snipers, have had ordnance dropped on them, walked across fields of improvised explosive devices, were burned alive in Humvees and other pieces of equipment that they served their time in.

It is not impersonal to us. We all know the stories. And I like to believe that we do take that very seriously.

And there is broad-based consensus on the fact that these AUMFs need to be changed. But to do that and to have the appropriate responsibility to those who go out there and fight the wars, we have to talk to the people who go out there and command the battles, that sit in the JOC and sit in the TOC, and sit in the Pentagon.

But, instead, what we did was we had professors from NYU and Harvard and Yale come in and speak to us for a few minutes about their opinions.

But what I can tell you is that a battlefield looks nothing like a lecture hall or a faculty lounge. They are not the same things. And their opinions are not nearly as weighty as those of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy or the Commandant of the Marine Corps or one of our combatant commanders.

If we take seriously this power that the 435 of us in this body have, not just to cast a vote, but to cast an informed vote to say that we went out there and did every bit of diligence that we could, it means speaking to those individuals, asking those questions, and then coming to the conclusions that bring us to the votes that we cast.

But without that, we are acting on pure arrogance that we know better without asking any questions, that we know what to do without going out there and seeking any facts, without finding out how this will affect the defense of our homeland. And it is not what gives the honor and respect to those who go out there and defend this country. It is not what gives the honor and respect to them that they deserve.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service, and I really respect him for what he

put on the line for our country. We will always do that.

But I will also say that those individuals who we did bring before the committee, though they might be professors now, they either served in the DOD or the White House, plus we had a classified briefing in the auditorium with representatives from the Joint Chiefs. So we were making sure that we had to get all of the information that we could in regards to this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health and Global Human Rights and the Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished author of this legislation, Congresswoman LEE, for bringing forth this legislation.

Madam Speaker, for the past 20 years, the 2002 Authorization has been used to wage war and cause destruction around the world.

While many in this Congress have participated in war, I am someone who has endured war and understands the impact it has on innocent lives. The act of war does nothing to make us safer.

Engaging in endless wars has led us to undermining our most important morals: peace, liberty, and justice.

Congress cannot sit idly by as we take more civilian lives and decrease our ability to build prosperity at home.

The more we spend on endless wars, the less we are able to invest in our own people with education, housing, and employment opportunities.

I am pleased that Congress is finally working on restoring its authority over matters of peace and war.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his comments about us seeking advice on Authorization for Use of Military Force from academics from Harvard, Yale, and NYU. And though they may have spent time serving in defense roles, I would remind the chairman that in the hearings that these academics voiced their opinions in, they expressed numerous times that they didn't even have the access to information that we had. They said it over and over. They didn't have the answers that we might have the answers to.

I would say it is incumbent upon this body to seek answers not from those who say we have more information, but to ask somebody who may potentially have more information than us so that we can make a more informed decision about policy that we are tasked with voting on that affects so many.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chair of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256.

Let me first recognize the tireless efforts of Representative BARBARA LEE, who has spearheaded this issue for nearly two decades and has been the moral conscience in Congress against endless, unjust wars.

The decision to go to war is one of the most profound and consequential a nation can make. This 2002 AUMF is outdated, and its repeal will end its legal authority to justify U.S. intervention in Iraq.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war. By repealing this authorization today, we are working to return this power back to the people's House and the Senate. That is how a checks and balances system works.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 256.

Though a combat-tested security partner, Iraq continues to be a fragile state. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force allowed the United States to end Saddam Hussein's reign of terror. It also allowed us to return and assist the people of Iraq when decisions made by the Obama-Biden administration led to the formation of ISIS and enabled the terror group to establish a caliphate in northwestern Iraq in 2014.

Now, that same Authorization for Use of Military Force provides the United States with the legal authority for military operations in support of our Iraqi partners, if needed, and against terrorist threats in Iraq, including those from the Iran-backed militia groups.

This critical piece of legislation provided the authority for last year's strike on Iran's terror mastermind Soleimani, whose IEDs, I might remind people, killed more than 600 American soldiers and wounded thousands more.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force also provides authority to strike Iranian-backed Shia militia groups that have and are currently attacking Americans in Iraq.

This shortsighted and purely political effort to repeal the authority without a replacement sends the wrong message and will embolden the Islamic terror groups and the world's largest state sponsor of terror, Iran.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill until we have a viable replacement that addresses the threat of Iran and its proxies.

We have already turned our backs on Afghanistan. We should not repeat this error in Iraq.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our illustrious leader and Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important and overdue legislation to the floor.

Congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, for being the chair of the committee and, as your ranking member has said, striving to act in a very bipartisan way. That doesn't hold for today necessarily; but, nonetheless, where there is a will, there is a way.

Madam Speaker, nearly 20 years have passed since the Congress passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and 10 years have passed since the formal end of U.S. military operations: Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Yet, today, 10 years later, our Nation is still operating under an outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, which risks being used, and in some cases has been used, as a blank check to conduct unrelated military operations.

Let me be clear. Repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in no way precludes us, our country, from defending our military and diplomatic personnel in Iraq. Article II of the Constitution, the 2001 AUMF, and the bilateral agreements with Iraq permit this.

But it will prevent a situation in which U.S. military personnel are deployed or military operations are conducted, without the approval of Congress or the country, for purposes that are unconnected to the AUMF's original purpose.

We are here because of the courage of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. No one has been fiercer or more relentless or more principled on this issue. I thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and others who have worked with her over the years.

I thank also our Foreign Affairs chair, GREGORY MEEKS, who has moved this bipartisan priority with both urgency and unity through the committee.

□ 1000

We are pleased that this legislation, which has previously passed the House twice, has over 130 cosponsors. Thank you, also, to Senator TIM KAINE, a longtime leader on AUMF repeal and reform in the Senate, who has introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF will defend Congress' constitutional authorities and our American democracy's system of separation of powers.

Under the Constitution, it is the Congress that has the sole duty to declare war. We must reassert that authority to decide if and when our country goes to war.

This repeal is also possible because of the leadership of President Joe Biden, who understands and has respect for Congress' constitutional authorities. He understands the need for this action to keep our troops and the American people safe. Again, that is our first responsibility: to protect and defend.

The Congress stands in agreement with the Biden-Harris administration, which has stated that “the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.”

Why has that been elusive, for us to come up with a better, more focused plan?

Madam Speaker, just for public information, when we have tried to come up with a newer, fresher, more appropriate AUMF, we have three challenges.

What is the scope? What is the Authorization for Use of Military Force for? Is it for boots on the ground? Is it for air? What is it for? What is the scope that we are giving the authority to the executive branch to use?

What is the geography? How far does that extend? Is this global? Is it specific to a region?

These are important decisions because some of the threats are, shall we say, unpredictable. But that doesn't mean what we do here should be unpredictable.

The third is the timing. How long does it last? What is it for? How far in geography does it extend? And how long does that authority last?

Over time, as we have tried to replace this outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, we have run into those disagreements internally as well as with the White House. But the more the public knows about our commitment to honoring our constitutional responsibility—and we will work with a President who is not here to undermine that—hopefully, we will have that authorization, as necessary, as we go forward.

As Members of Congress, the first duty we have is to keep the American people safe. That includes our courageous men and women in uniform, who sacrifice every day for our freedoms.

To do this, we must pursue a National Security Strategy and a defense policy that are smart, strong, and strategic. And we look forward to working with the administration on this vital mission.

With that, I again salute our distinguished colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her persistence and her leadership; our distinguished chairman, Mr. GREGORY MEEKS.

Again, I am grateful for the courteous consideration of this legislation today, although we may not be in complete agreement.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for H.R. 256, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and hope that we will have a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WATERS), the chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Chairman GREGORY MEEKS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's resolution to repeal the outdated 2002 AUMF, which was used to start the Iraq war, which killed more than 4,500 American soldiers and approximately 200,000 Iraqi civilians.

As the chair of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I worked with Congresswoman LEE and our former colleague, Lynn Woolsey, to end the Iraq war and bring our troops home.

The Iraq war finally ended in December 2011. We cannot allow this outdated AUMF to be used as a blank check for future wars. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in authorizing and providing oversight over United States military action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

The United States Congress has the sole constitutional power to declare war and, therefore, a constitutional duty to consider, debate, and, if necessary, repeal an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The very title of this AUMF shows how much it has strayed from its original purpose. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq was designed to address the threat posed by an Iraq run by Saddam Hussein. He has been dead for many years.

We have the responsibility to members of the Armed Forces who risk their lives, and the American public who fund these seemingly endless conflicts, to terminate the current 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. Since 2009, I voted consistently to revoke this open-ended authorization and to reassert Congress' role.

For too long, we have failed this responsibility. Congress must act now to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), a distinguished Member.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we, who are honored to be Members of Congress, are here to pass judgment on the great issues of our time. There is no greater issue of our time than the issue of war and peace. It is about life and death.

We should not be allowed to escape our duty, responsibility, and obligation to vote on issues of war and peace.

We must repeal this authorization so that Congress can take up its responsibility and vote on the great issues of our time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for recognizing me and yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to repeal the AUMF resolution of 2002. Here we are, in 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against that AUMF, and to this day, I believe it produced one of the worst foreign policy disasters in U.S. history. It was built on a lie; it claimed the lives of over 4,400 Americans and countless Iraqi civilians; and it cost our Treasury trillions of dollars.

The Iraq war ended 10 years ago, but this AUMF is still on the books. It is a blank check, and we need to get rid of it. We run the risk that administrations will misuse it to justify future military action and directly undermine Congress' Article I war powers authority.

The House has voted three times to repeal this AUMF, and today, it is time to pass it. Let us have a victory here on the floor—and celebrate another victory that the Supreme Court has upheld the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to recognize a gentleman who I want to thank for his service, for he is a Marine combat veteran who served in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 256 to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force that sent me and thousands of other young Americans into war in Iraq.

Even though the mission in Iraq has been over for almost a decade, this authorization remains on the books. This is not a mistake or an oversight. It is a dangerous abdication of Congress' responsibility.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the more opportunity it has to be abused as a blank check for military action in the Middle East without the input of the American people.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the longer we in Congress are bending our own moral and constitutional duty to debate and to decide when to send American soldiers into harm's way and to look into the eyes of servicemen and -women when we do. We cannot run from this incredible responsibility any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and re-taking Congress' constitutional role in exercising our war powers.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), my friend.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was a sophomore in high school when Congress gave the green light for war in Iraq. Nearly 20 years later, I am here as a freshman Member of Congress, urging my colleagues to repeal that authorization.

For over half my life, Republican and Democratic Presidential administrations have used the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force as a blank check for war and the justification for aggressive military actions in the Middle East.

Young people today have never known a time when our country was not fighting overseas or conducting strikes on poor and Brown nations. It is time for that to stop.

The American people are tired of endless wars. We need a more peaceful and productive foreign policy grounded in diplomacy and human rights, and we, finally, have an administration that agrees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution, Congresswoman LEE's longtime effort to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The Constitution is clear: Only Congress has the power to authorize war.

In 2002, this resolution was adopted in order to address the ongoing threat from Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq, the threat that it represented to America. Saddam Hussein is gone. A new government has been established in Iraq, and this AUMF is obsolete.

There are threats to the United States, and we have the authority to address those threats when they arise. There are ongoing threats that we ought to be able to debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives and act upon when our security is threatened. But no President of any party should ever be able to reach back two decades when Congress, on a different fact situation, authorized the use of force in order to authorize any use of force that they deemed to be important to them.

Congress has this authority, and we need to assert it. That is what we do today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment, once again, that repealing this Author-

ization for Use of Military Force, which has been used in the past to take out Soleimani and other very bad actors, and not replacing it does not uphold our Article I responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, what we are doing is ceding our authority under the Constitution to the executive branch and saying: Oh, Article II, the President has unlimited discretion under Article II to do whatever the hell he wants to do.

That is not what this Congress should be doing. We need to replace this with an updated AUMF that reflects the threats in the region, the current threats, which are Iran and the proxies of Iran that have hit our embassy, have killed our soldiers, and are attacking our diplomats in the region.

□ 1015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Texas that maybe we should do—if you think Iran is a threat—an AUMF for Iran. This AUMF was for Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to repeal an almost two decades-long Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying thank you, thank you, thank you to my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I was an activist back in 2001, leading the largest immigrant advocacy organization and the largest march at the time against the war in Iraq, because we knew that what was happening was wrong. And we were looking at Congress, and saying, Congress needs to make sure they are taking action, and BARBARA LEE stood up at that time on her own.

The 2002 AUMF was based on a lie; a lie that has resulted in hundreds of thousands of lives lost, including civilians, U.S. servicemembers, journalists, humanitarian workers; a lie that was used as the legal basis for military hostilities beyond Iraq, hostilities that were never authorized by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this must be the beginning and not the end of our work to end endless wars. We must continue our work to forge a meaningful engagement with the rest of the world toward a lasting peace. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the chairman for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just a point of clarification to the chairman. I am not talking about a declaration of war against Iran. What we are talking about is what is the current threat in Iraq. Today, it is proxies, the Shia proxies of Iran in Iraq.

The reason why President Biden hit them in Syria, it is the authorities that President Trump used to take out Soleimani in Iraq, not in Iran. Soleimani, "The Butcher", the master-

mind of terror for two decades, killing 600 American soldiers and wounding thousands more.

I am all for updating this thing, but to replace this and throw it out with not anything to protect our men and women who are in Iraq today, including the diplomats, is highly irresponsible, it is reckless, and it is dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote, once again, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force because we cannot continue endless wars.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF authorization for war again Saddam Hussein's regime. I voted against that resolution. And, now, here we are nearly 20 years later, and we have seen three successive administrations use the AUMF to wage war in ways that were never intended, that were way beyond the scope of the congressional authorization that was used.

Only Congress has the authority to declare war. And it is time for us to reclaim that authority. We can't let another day go by with this authorization in place. We cannot support endless wars.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the lead Republican on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that this argument that we have to get rid of the AUMF is just ridiculous. We pass the National Defense Authorization Act every year. We have passed it every year for 60 consecutive years. If we don't want to authorize something we are doing militarily, we can stop it at any time. So this is a false argument that we have to do this to be able to prevent what we are doing in Afghanistan or Iraq or anyplace else.

But with regard to this specific bill, this is a bad deal for our national security and the safety of American servicemembers overseas. Since the liberation of Iraq, the murderous Iranian regime has armed proxy organizations to kill Americans and innocent Iraqis.

Iran has armed proxy militias with small arms, mortars, rockets, and now sophisticated UAVs that can avoid base defenses. The Obama and Trump administrations both used the 2002 AUMF to target terrorist threats originating from Iraq.

Threats like ISIS and militias backed by Iran have killed and injured American servicemembers and contractors. This bill would repeal the 2002 AUMF and offer nothing in its place; no authorization to mop up ISIS forces or whatever movement comes next; no authorization to target Iranian proxies whose sole goal is to destabilize Iraq and kill Americans.

This bill only offers the illusion of withdrawal. Like President Biden's

failing Afghanistan strategy, it does nothing to change the reality on the ground in Iraq. The threats we face today will remain, and American commanders will be forced to face those threats with one fewer tool than they had the day before.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF without a replacement only undermines our national security. It offers no real solution to the issues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my friend that this 2002 AUMF has not been utilized as the sole reason or the sole authority in over 10 years. The 2001 AUMF is still in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), who is a colonel, retired, and we thank him for his service in our military.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on repealing the 2002 AUMF. That was the authorization that sent me and hundreds of thousands of servicemen and -women to Iraq since the invasion in 2003. The justification for that war was fundamentally flawed.

But to be certain, the purpose of the 2002 AUMF established a broad military mission in Iraq. Yet, I have no doubt that that mission that we were given has been completed. And, sadly, the Nation has lost more than 4,400 brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who were engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It is time for us, for Congress and the American people, to formally recognize the end of America's 2002 mission in Iraq. This is an important first step. As Congress, once again, reasserts its responsibility in the use of our military forces by authorizing frameworks that address current threats to our Nation and that we authorize the use of military force only as the last resort.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. We need to exercise our Article I constitutional responsibilities and update this outdated AUMF. That is precisely what we are arguing today. We are not saying that we should replace this, but we shouldn't repeal without an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats.

As I close later, I will talk about the chairman and I working on that effort. That is what this body should be doing, because otherwise, if we repeal this, we are again ceding our Article I responsibilities to the executive, and just giving him unlimited Article II powers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE), and I thank the gentlewoman for her bipartisan spirit in coming down to the floor today to speak on this AUMF.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle for giving me a minute on this issue. I want to thank our veterans that have given lifelong service to their country.

Nearly two decades ago, Congress authorized the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but ever since, three President's, both Republican and Democrat, have used this permission to drag out conflicts and to get us into new ones.

Americans who weren't even alive on 9/11 or during the invasion of Iraq are still fighting and dying there, in Syria, across Africa, and who knows where else. Our Founders wisely gave Congress the exclusive constitutional authority over whether our Nation goes to war.

Sadly, Congress has failed to perform this sacred duty for far too long. This is about restoring the powers set forth in Article I. Congress can go to war with anyone under Article I. When Washington drags us into a war, they aren't the ones who go do the fighting and dying, our children are. The very least we can do is give their parents a say in when and where and if their kids will fight and die thousands of miles away.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think I laid out our arguments, and I think it is irresponsible to repeal this authority, which still is used to protect our embassy diplomats and soldiers in Iraq against the Shia proxies of Iran.

I am committed to work with the chairman to update this outdated AUMF. And I think if there is any agreement in this Chamber, and also on both sides of the aisle, it is that we need to modernize it to the modern-day threats.

And as I read from the President's Statement of Administration Policy, the President says: I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

I agree with the President of the United States, and I think the chairman does as well. We have to do this, and it is not going to be easy, but it is time to update this outdated AUMF.

I would prefer to have repealed and replaced it with our updated AUMF. But as BRIAN MAST, a heroic veteran who lost his legs in battle, said, We cannot just repeal this and talk about updating when we haven't even talked to the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the intelligence community about what is the modern-day threat, and what we need to do in Congress to exercise our Article I responsibilities that we have a responsibility to do, and not just cede everything to the executive branch under Article II.

The argument is made, well, this could be done under Article II. Well, that is probably true. But are we not abdicating our responsibility and ceding it to the executive branch by doing this? I would argue that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the motion to recommit.

If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider my amendment to H.R. 256. It responds to the serious escalation by Hamas against Israel that we saw in May.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, Hamas launched over 4,000 rockets at our closest allies in the Middle East. This was a stark reminder of the dangerous threats that Israel faces from Hamas, Hezbollah, Iran, and other terrorist organizations.

For this reason, our MTR makes sure that the United States can quickly react to Israel's security needs in the event of future attacks.

If enacted, this language would establish contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles such as munitions, ISR technology, aircraft, and related services. It would also create a waiver to expedite arms transfers if Israel is under threat of military attack.

This language passed the House last Congress with broad bipartisan support, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it today.

I fear that the 2002 AUMF repeal we are considering today without a replacement may embolden our adversaries, especially Iran—the largest state sponsor of terror in the world—and its proxies by signaling that we are retreating from the Middle East.

Our MTR is intended to send a strong message that this is absolutely false. It will also send a message that passage will demonstrate our ironclad support for Israel and all our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work. As he has indicated, it is a pleasure working with him on this committee and working collectively and having open and honest dialog where we agree and where we disagree. The manner in which we do that, I think, serves this body in a very good way, and I look forward to continuing to work with him in that regard.

Even though we see this a little differently, I will say right now that I am

ready to work with the gentleman in repealing and replacing the 2001 AUMF. I think that is what we utilized as primary for the 2014 ISIS issue in dealing with all of the terrorists and terrorism that is going on. But the 2002 AUMF was specific to Iraq.

Our duty and our responsibility in what took place is over. There comes a time when certain AUMFs simply become outdated and need to be repealed. We are going to do two others. We have an AUMF still on the books from 1957. We have another one that is on the books from 1991. There is no need to repeal and replace. They are outdated. Once they become outdated, let's just remove them from the books.

So let me again reiterate this: the repealing of the 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any outgoing military operations in Iraq. In fact, the only thing leaving the AUMF on the books does is risk inviting future administrations to try to stretch its legal authority and bypass Congress' constitutional obligation to make decisions on matters of war and peace, thereby getting past and abdicating our responsibilities under Article I authority and allow the executive to interpret the AUMFs far beyond their intent.

So the repeal of the 2002 AUMF is only one in a series of steps that Congress must take to reclaim its Article I authority, but it is, indeed, an important step. Today's historic vote is a turning point to quickly bring an end to this outdated AUMF. I understand from listening to the Senate that the Senate's intention also is to quickly bring the 2002 AUMF repeal for a vote.

So I look forward to Congress no longer taking a backseat on some of the most consequential decisions our Nation can make.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Out of Iraq Caucus, and a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256, which repeals the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq passed by Congress nearly twenty years ago on October 16, 2002 as Pub. L. 107-243.

I extend my thanks and deep appreciation to our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her tireless and unwavering devotion to repealing this misguided AUMF and acknowledging the grievous mistake history has shown it to be and as many of predicted at the time it would be.

Congress never intended for the 2002 AUMF to have such broad and extended reach.

Over the last 18 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use this legislation as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

The 2002 AUMF is an outdated piece of legislation and repealing it will not affect any current military operations.

Moreover, the 2002 AUMF is unnecessary because everything the 2002 AUMF covers is already fully covered under the 2001 9/11 AUMF, except for attacks against Iran.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to address the perceived threat posed by the re-

gime of Saddam Hussein and the AUMF permitted the President to use the armed forces as "necessary and appropriate" to "defend U.S. national security against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and to "enforce all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF—dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—officially concluded in 2011.

Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers Iraq a key ally.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war and repealing obsolete Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs) is essential for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities.

Leaving the 2002 AUMF in place increases the likelihood that future presidents will use it as a basis to start a new war, or expand a current one, without Congress's explicit authorization.

In July 2019, the House adopted a Lee amendment to NDAA virtually identical to H.R. 256, To Repeal the AUMF Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, by a bipartisan vote of 242 to 180.

The overly broad 2002 AUMF represents deterioration of Congressional oversight.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

Congress must repeal the 2002 AUMF immediately to fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide oversight and consent on matters of war and peace.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, since the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) have been achieved, I believe the authorization to use that military force expired automatically.

That is why thirteen years ago, on October 31, 2007, I introduced H.R. 4020, the "Military Success in Iraq Commemoration Act of 2007," which acknowledged and affirmed that the two objectives of the 2002 AUMF—(1) to defend the national security of the United States and (2) to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq—had in fact been achieved and called upon the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe a national day of celebration commemorating military success in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, where a Congressional authorization to use military force has expired, the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use of force.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to expand military operations in the region, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and our allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 18 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

More than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in the Persian Gulf exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Iraq.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and the legislation before us is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for introducing this legislation and urge all Members to vote for H.R. 256 and repeal the misguided and certainly outdated 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force in Iraq.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 256, legislation to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 ("2002 AUMF").

This authorization has outlived its usefulness, if it ever had one. My position on the Iraq war has been clear: I opposed the occupation of Iraq and the damage it unleashed. We were wise to exit this quagmire while retaining the ability to address any legitimate security threats emanating from this region.

But we left the 2002 AUMF in place, which was a mistake. First the Obama Administration and now the Biden Administration have made clear it is no longer needed. As noted by the Biden Administration, "repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations."

Additionally, I share concerns that failure to repeal the 2002 AUMF will allow it to continue to be misused to legitimize U.S. military actions that were never contemplated when it was passed, including in areas far outside of Iraq.

It's time that Congress begins to reclaim its war powers. Repealing this outdated 2002 AUMF will also allow our country to refocus our military strategies and efforts towards defending against legitimate national security threats facing our country. We will never stop open ended war if we never reconsider the open-ended authorizations that are feeding them. The Constitution is clear about Congress' authority. These are difficult decisions but every time we punt on reasserting our authority regarding sending our men and women in uniform to war, we weaken our institution and our democracy.

Today's vote marks the fourth time in the past three years that the House has passed similar legislation in a bipartisan fashion. Today's action hopefully marks the last time we do so and that we will finally see this legislation enacted into law.

I support H.R. 256 and the termination of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 256, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCCAUL is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to provide assistance to the Government of Israel in order to help enable Israel to defend itself by itself and develop long-term capacity, primarily through the acquisition of advanced capabilities that are available from the United States.

SEC. 3. CONTINGENCY PLANS TO PROVIDE ISRAEL WITH NECESSARY DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.

The President shall establish and update as appropriate contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles and defense services that are determined by the President to be necessary for the defense of Israel.

SEC. 4. WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving information that Israel is under an existing or imminent threat of military attack, the President may waive the requirements of this Act and direct the immediate transfer to Israel of such defense articles or defense services the President determines to be necessary to assist Israel in its defense against such threat. Amounts obligated or expended to carry out this paragraph shall not be subject to any limitation in law, or provision of any bilateral agreement, relating to the amount of United States assistance authorized to be made available to Israel.

“(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after a transfer of defense articles or defense services pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (1), the President shall provide a notification in writing to Congress of the details of such transfer, consistent with the requirements of section 36 of this Act.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 219, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—204

Aderholt	Gohmert	Moore (AL)
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Murphy (NC)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Nehls
Babin	Gosar	Newhouse
Bacon	Granger	Norman
Baird	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Obernolte
Banks	Greene (GA)	Owens
Barr	Griffith	Palazzo
Bentz	Grothman	Palmer
Bergman	Guest	Pence
Bice (OK)	Guthrie	Perry
Biggs	Hagedorn	Pfluger
Billirakis	Harris	Posey
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Reed
Boebert	Hern	Reschenthaler
Bost	Herrell	Rodgers (WA)
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Buck	Hill	Rosendale
Bucshon	Hinson	Rouzer
Budd	Hollingsworth	Roy
Burchett	Hudson	Rutherford
Burgess	Huizenga	Salazar
Calvert	Issa	Scalise
Cammack	Jackson	Schweikert
Carl	Jacobs (NY)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Sessions
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Cawthorn	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cloud	Katko	Spartz
Clyde	Keller	Staubert
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Steel
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Steil
Crenshaw	Kinzinger	Steube
Curtis	Kustoff	Stewart
Davidson	LaHood	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Tenney
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Tiffany
Donalds	LaTurner	Timmons
Duncan	Lesko	Turner
Dunn	Letlow	Upton
Emmer	Long	Valadao
Estes	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Feenstra	Lucas	Van Duyne
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Walberg
Fitzgerald	Mann	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fox	McClain	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Westerman
Scott	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Fulcher	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wittman
Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Womack
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	Young
Garcia (CA)	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
Gibbs	Moolenaar	
Gimenez	Mooney	

NAYS—219

Adams	Carson	Dean
Agullar	Carter (LA)	DeFazio
Allred	Cartwright	DeGette
Auchincloss	Case	DeLauro
Axne	Casten	DelBene
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Delgado
Bass	Castro (TX)	Demings
Beatty	Chu	DeSaulnier
Bera	Cicilline	Deuch
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Escobar
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bonamici	Cohen	Espallat
Bourdeaux	Connolly	Evans
Bowman	Cooper	Fletcher
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Foster
F.	Costa	Frankel, Lois
Brown	Courtney	Galleo
Brownley	Craig	Garamendi
Bush	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Bustos	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Butterfield	Cuellar	Golden
Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	

Gonzalez, Vicente	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Gotthelmer	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Green, Al (TX)	Manning	Scanlon
Grijalva	Massie	Schakowsky
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schiff
Hayes	McBath	Schneider
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Schrader
Himes	McEachin	Schrier
Horsford	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Houlahan	McNerney	Scott, David
Hoyer	Meeks	Sewell
Huffman	Meng	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Mfume	Sherrill
Jacobs (CA)	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jayapal	Morelle	Slotkin
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Mrvan	Soto
Johnson (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Spanberger
Jones	Nadler	Speier
Kahele	Napolitano	Stansbury
Kaptur	Neal	Stanton
Keating	Neguse	Stevens
Kelly (IL)	Newman	Strickland
Khanna	Norcross	Suozi
Kildee	O'Halleran	Swalwell
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano
Kim (NJ)	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Panetta	Titus
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Tlaib
Kuster	Pascrell	Tonko
Lamb	Payne	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Trahan
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Trone
Larson (CT)	Phillips	Underwood
Lawrence	Pingree	Vargas
Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Porter	Vela
Lee (NV)	Pressley	Velázquez
Leger Fernandez	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Levin (CA)	Quigley	Schultz
Levin (MI)	Raskin	Waters
Lieu	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Ross	Welch
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Luria	Ruiz	Wild
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)
Mace	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Malinowski	Ryan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Doyle, Michael	Green (TN)	Rice (SC)
F.	Harshbarger	Torres (NY)
Fallon	McHenry	

□ 1102

Messrs. CASE, MRVAN, STANTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCARELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ZELDIN, DAVIDSON, HOLLINGSWORTH, and BUDD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, due to a committee hearing with Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, I was unable to make rollcall Vote 171 on the Motion to Recommit offered by Mr. McCaul of Texas. I would like the record to note that I would have supported the Motion to Recommit and have a long history of supporting our ally, Israel.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas	Gonzalez, Vicente	Kim (NJ)
(Gomez)	(Pallone)	
Cicilline	(Gomez)	Kirkpatrick
(Pingree)	Granger	(Stanton)
Cleaver (Davids	(Arrington)	Langevin
(KS))	Grijalva (García	(Courtney)
DeSaulnier	(IL))	Lawson (FL)
(Thompson	Himes	(Evans)
(CA))	(Courtney)	Lieu (Raskin)
Frankel, Lois	Hoyer (Brown)	Lowenthal
(Clark (MA))	Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)
Gimenez (Waltz)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Clark
	Kahele (Mrvan)	(MA))

Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)

Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)

Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BONAMICI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 161, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—268

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene

Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster

Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley

Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Scanlon
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schneider
Schriber
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suzuki
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany

NAYS—161

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Calvert
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)

Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Malliotakis
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Green (TN) McHenry

□ 1127

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I was forced to miss votes on June 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170,

“yea” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Cicilline
(Pingree)
Cleaver (Davids
(KS))
DeSaulnier
(Thompson
(CA))
Frankel, Lois
(Clark (MA))
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Gomez)
Granger
(Arrington)
Grijalva (Garcia
(IL))
Harshbarger
(Kustoff)
Himes
(Courtney)

Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kim (NJ)
(Pallone)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Courtney)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu (Raskin)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Meng (Clark
(MA))
Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)

Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)
Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

□ 1130

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECO- NOMIC DISPARITY AND FAIR- NESS IN GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members to the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth:

Mr. HIMES, Connecticut, Chair
Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio
Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. JAYAPAL, Washington
Ms. CRAIG, Minnesota
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
Ms. JACOBS, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the House majority whip the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman letting me stand in today for the majority leader.

Next week, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete